



## WEEKLY HERALD AND PHILANTHROPIST.

### Editorial Courtesy.

"In conclusion Mr. Mansfield would be much pleased to aid Mr. Cass and all others who hold the same position of Emancipation, in saving from Political and Ecclesiastical contumacy all that violence, unfairness and disrepute of language and manners, which far too much and too often characterize some of the most influential presses of this country." No man, we trust, can ever become an intelligent writer, much less a gentleman and a Christian.

*Cincinnati Chronicle.*

As these gentlemen chose to call themselves by their proper names, we may be permitted to depart in this instance from a proper usage, and follow their example.

To the excellent sentiments, expressed by Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Case cordially responded; and men began to think that these two remarkably respectable gentlemen were therefore to be bright examples of the virtues they so much extolled. Alas! that people will talk one way, and walk another. The latest illustration by Mr. Mansfield of the beauty of editorial courtesy and fairness, was displayed in his paper of Thursday afternoon. Choosing to understand a jocular paragraph in the Herald about lawyers and soldiers, as seriously intended, Mr. Mansfield indulges in some truly solemn reflections, closing with the following gentlemanly paragraph:

"But we shall argue nothing on the subject. We should think it silly to argue a fish of skin to a horseback rider, to argue such points with any one who holds such opinions as those expressed by the *Herald*. It is difficult to say which shines more in this paragraph, Mr. Mansfield's brilliant fancy, as a writer, or Mr. Mansfield's elegant courtesy, as a gentleman.

But, Mr. Mansfield is also a truth-loving man—"no misrepresentation of facts," he holds, "can ever become an intelligent writer, much less a gentleman and a Christian." Now for a characteristic illustration. Last Thursday afternoon, Mr. Mansfield penned the following sentence:

"The Morning Herald, as all in Cincinnati know, is a Lucifer paper, professing to be a Liberty paper."

And yet Mr. Mansfield is an honorable man—"an intelligent writer," "a gentleman and a Christian!" We do not contradict such a statement, for the simple reason that it would be folly to contradict a statement which "all in Cincinnati" know to be totally false.

So much for the teacher of courtesy in editorial intercourse. A few words now for the benefit of the reader's confidential informant, Mr. Case.

Mr. Case inserted a contemptuous paragraph in his paper concerning our series of articles on war. We replied in a dozen lines, in words, designed to make him feel that he had made a *faux pas*. They answered their purpose. But, contemptuous indifference was exchanged for complaining anger, and Mr. Case retorted in the style of the school to which he belongs. Not having been educated in that school, we did not deem it necessary, or even feel an inclination to retaliate; but we wrote an article on the Government of Parties, making the reply of Mr. Case our text, without allowing ourselves to utter a single remark that could possibly be construed as personal. This drew from that gentleman an elaborate article, more than a column and a half long, ornate with personalities, as "impudent assertions," "contemptuous impudence," "ignorance and ignorance," &c. Did Mr. Case think it possible for us to reply to such abuse?

"Far nobler fartrum!" We commend to Mr. Mansfield, the preacher of courtesy, and Mr. Case, the commentator, their own abstract sentiments, hoping that as this is an age of progress, they may yet be able to illustrate their abstractions in their daily life.

We do not complain—our arrows are never so aimed as to pierce between the joints of the harness. We notice their conduct, not from remembrance or from an apprehension that it can injure us in any way; but because, our position being from its very nature one of antagonism to the old party-organizations, we are anxious, as much as possible to smooth down the asperities of editorial warfare with their adherents.

When we charge that the Whig or the Democratic party is servile to Slavery, neither Mr. Case nor Mr. Mansfield is warranted in regarding it as a personal attack. If they believe the charge untrue, it is their right and duty to say so, and, if they can, to prove what they say—but what right has either to assail the other personally, and lower themselves as well as the controversy, by making a personal matter of it?

We shall not complain; they must excuse us, if after this exposition of the matter, we shall deem it unnecessary to notice any thing in their articles, except what bears upon the questions at issue between us.

### A Beautiful Response.

A short time since a sisterly address on peace was sent by 1,623 women of Exeter, England, to the women of Philadelphia. A response has been prepared, and is now awaiting signatures in the latter city. The Philadelphia Enquirer, trusts that hundreds will sign it. We hope the signers will count by thousands, instead of hundreds. The influence of this delightful interchange of sympathies, between the people of two countries, claiming a common ancestry, and closely allied by language, customs and interests, must prove a powerful.

We have repeatedly quoted the evidence in support of all these statements—it is unnecessary now to re-produce it. The Madison papers, Eliot's Debate, and the records of the Debates in the various State Conventions called to consider the new Constitution, as well as coterminous history, sustain completely every statement we have made.

Now, let us suppose that the Government thus constituted, had been administered from the beginning up to this hour, in accordance with the spirit, intention and policy of those who framed the constitution, and in harmony with its general provisions, proceeding uniformly upon the principle of strictly interpreting every compromise in regard to slavery, what would have been its effect?

It was supposed at that the British squadron had orders to prevent the American squadron from taking possession of any ports of Mexico on the Pacific; but doubtless with your word of peace, and thank you.

It is now to the reader's judgment to judge of the merits of the question now at issue between our respective governments. But we know, our hearts tell us that, whenever men may deem it honorable to make war, nothing so nobly serves the cause of justice. We have knowledge, with the most sacred obligation that rests upon us in the tender relations which we sustain as daughters, sisters, wives and mothers, to study the things which make for peace. It is a plain duty, and one acceptable to God, to be a Christian in the world.

Another of our common faith, to diffuse in our households, and far and wide in the world, the heavenly fragrance of that unity more precious than the raiment which Mary pour'd upon the head of Jesus, has filled all the houses of our friends. Her offering, however, only as a preparation for his burial, and yet has it been immortalized. Our shall help to make his spirit live again in the hearts of all men. And wherever his God of Peace shall be present throughout the world, it may be spoken of as a marvel of the women of England and America, that they have sought, with one heart to do this service for their spiritual friend, the Saviour of mankind.

"Friends were born between our respective countries, which God has mercy over, and which we have good hope, will be averted—may the women of both lands be ready to use their great power to mitigate its horrors, to bid it a short farewell. The countrymen may inflict, and send home the power of war, disarmed of every hostile intent, and with a heart full of the love of Peace.

"With a friend regard,

"Yours in the sisterhood of humanity."

A few days since we published a letter from the Mayor, Municipal authorities and a large portion of the citizens of Exeter, England, to the people of Cincinnati. It was evidently Christian in tone, and unexceptionable in sentiment. We presume a copy of the same address was forwarded to every other paper in Cincinnati, but we have not noticed its appearance in any but the Herald. Perhaps our brethren of the Press do not attach the same importance to these greetings that we do—but no influence that can tend to slate national prejudices and promote the feeling of brotherhood between the various branches of the human family, ought

to be despised. What will friends & friends in the Exeter address? Several copies could be prepared, and left at various points in the city for signatures. Hundreds of the citizens of Cincinnati would rejoice at an opportunity of thus bearing a quiet, but efficient testimony in favor of the cause of peace.

### Trouble in Mercer County.

The attempt to colonize in Mercer county the slaves emancipated by the will of John Randolph, is exciting some sensation in Mercer county.

The citizens of several Townships, it is said, have resolved rigidly to enforce the Black Laws in Mercer. The *Cincinnati Enquirer* says:

"The abolitionists may discover in the state of things now existing in Mercer county a foreshadowing of the practical consequences of their extreme dogmas."

No sir, the abolitionists discover in this state of things the practical consequences of the existence of Slavery in the South, and the encouragement given to it by the North, especially by the Democratic Party. Abolish Slavery, as the abolitionists insist, and there will be no colonization of colored people in Northern States. It is the vital system of Slavery, over which the Democratic Party stands as a sentinel, and the cruel laws it originates that have driven the unfortunate people emancipated by Randolph, into the State of Ohio. They came not here voluntarily, but by the will of the slaveholders, who, we doubt not, are held in high favor by the disturbed citizens of Mercer county. Humanity should move them to pity and aid those poor exiles who seek a shelter in their forests, where their presence can harm nobody. Justice should awaken indignation against the men who have driven them from their homes.

### The Cincinnati Enquirer and Slavery.

The following is a paragraph from the article of the *Enquirer*, to which we referred last Saturday:

"The too bad that 'the government of party in this country, has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,' is one of those round and impudent assertions with which such spirits as the *Herzen* and *Stepanov* are organizationally possessed."

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the *dark despotism of slavery*,"

"However, an evil fastened upon the country long before the Revolution, for which no party is to be blamed. The question arose immediately after the Revolution, as to what should be done with slavery, and by a compromise, it was decided to leave it with the South, as it existed, separating the South from the North, and up to the latitude of the free Hudson Bay Company and British subjects trading with that Company."

The terms, the same paper thinks, are not quite so favorable as those offered by Mr. Galatin in 1817.

We rejoice at the settlement of this great question. In the beginning of the controversy, we maintained what still we believe, that neither country had any right of sovereignty to any portion of the territory—that the settlers and aborigines had this right. But, since both countries have set up claims to it, which was necessary to settle by negotiation or the sword, we are glad that they have settled these claims by a compromise, which leaves the honor of both nations unimpeachable, except in the sole matter of claiming what neither had any title to.

The question of slavery agitated the Convention which formed the federal Constitution. Its sectional character gave rise even there to sectional debate, and sectional calculations.

Slavery was regarded as an evil and a disgrace by the delegates from all the States, except South Carolina and Georgia.

At last the discordant views respecting it were compromised, by leaving the disposition of it to the States in which it then existed, with the common understanding that the overthrow of the latter, it was thought, would leave it, as one not easily disposed of, and are content to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and to *try to work out* the problem of its final extinction."

The Herald asserts that "the government of party in this country has hitherto been wielded as an instrument of the <



